he object is to make these bounties a lands. The amendment which I have proposed that effect, because this land scrip will be charged that effect, because this land scrip will be charged that effect, because this land scrip will be charged that of every dollar's worth of the control of every dollar's worth of the control of the contro Now, the object is to make these bot

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I see a great deal of force in the argument urged by the gentleman from Virginia, so far as the Eastern States are concerned. It did not strike me in that light before. I am aware that volunteers and soldiers who reside in the East and in the South will find it very inconvenient to make these entries. I think the argument very foreible in that respect. My only fear is that speculators will derive the whole benefit from the scrip. However, I prefer that this amendment should prevail rather than the one which the Senator threatens. And I do not see that this amendment can affect the bill very materially. It may be a convenience to persons here in the East, in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, and all along the eastern part of the country. If such be the effect, I have no objection.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I perceive that the bill, as it stands, with the amendment reported by the committee, will extend to these soldiers all the relief which can be desired by the honorable Senator from, Virginia. And if the

ired by the honorable Senator from Virginia. And if the ill is to pass at all, I am decidedly in favor of the bill with the amendment reported by the Committee on the Public Lands. And I do not concur with my honorable friend from Illinois, in regarding this amendment as unimportant. But if the amendment is to be rejected, I carnestly hope that the amendment proposed by the honorable Senator from Virginia will not be sanctioned by the Senate.

will not be sanctioned by the Senate.

If I mistake not, the amendment reported from the Committee on the Public Lands agrees in terms exactly with the provisions of the bill granting bounties to the soldiers who were engaged in the Mexican war. I had occasion to look somewhat carefully some time since into the amount of the charge on the Treasury of the United States, by virtue of the provisions of the bill granting bounties to the soldiers engaged in the Mexican war; and I found it, on inquiry at the Treasury. in the Mexican war; and I found it, on inquiry at the Treasury, to be a mere trifle. The whole amount of those bounties, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, was, I believe, something like 14,400,000 acres of land, amounting to about eighteen millions of dollars. And the commutation money, as I ascertained on inquiry of the Register of the Treasury, under the provisions of the law to which I refer, amounted to only about a quarter of a million of dollars.—I think two hundred and sixty odd thousand dollars. Ins—I think two hundred and sixty odd thousand collars. The reason for that is, I suppose, to be found in the fact that the parties holding this scrip could go into the market and sell it. And I believe it has uniformly brought in the market something over \$100 for a quarter section of land. Consequently, the soldier could obtain in the market more than the commutation price provided for in the bill to which I refer.

But it is proposed by the provisions of this bill—I do not re-collect whether by the original provisions of the bill or by virtue of some amendment reported by the committee—that this land should be granted directly to the soldiers; that they should take the title to the land which is to be conferred upon them by the Government, and that they should not have scrip
for the purpose of taking it into market.

Mr. FELCH, (in his seat.) That was an amendment
which was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. That was an amendment which has been
adopted by the Senate. I most cordially approve of the

adopted by the Senate. I most cordially approve of the

This scrip for a quarter section of land, which, according to the minimum price, would amount to \$200, has been uniformly sold for something over \$100 up to the present price, which, I have understood, is about \$125. Now, this does not enure at all to the benefit of the settlers on the public lands. I venture to say that there is not one case out of a hundred where the actual settler has obtained this scrip at the reduced price. It is uniformly purchased by speculators. I have some information on this subject which I desire to state to the Senate, and that is the principal object I had in view In now

rising to address the Senate.

These speculators, or rather capitalists, who are desirous of the second sec loaning money at a higher rate than the ordinary interest allowed by the laws of the land, go into the market and purchase this scrip at the reduced price, from something over \$100 for a quarter section of land up to the present market price, which I have understood is about \$125. They purrespectively and seek out that portion of the people who are in possession of the public lands, those who are entitled to pre-emption rights; and they make a contract with them. They take out the patent in their own names, and give them a contract to transfer the title at the minimum price—at \$1.25 cents per acre. I understand that in the State of Iowa the legal rate of interest is ten per cent. per annum. These speculators will purchase scrip for a quarter section at, say, \$125; and go to Iowa and make a contract with the stipulate for ten per cent. interest, and these enter into an agreement to transfer the land when it is paid for. In this way, they will succeed in obtaining 15, 20, and 30 per cent per annum on their money.

Mr. JONES, (in his seat.) And sometimes fifty per

Mr. SMITH. And, as my worthy friend says, sometime

even fifty per cent per annum.

Now, there have been, from this source, enormous evils to the country. If this bill is to pass in the form in which bounties were granted in the case of the soldiers in the Mexican war, that evil is to be most enormously aggravated. I can war, that evil is to be most enormously aggravated. I doubt exceedingly, Mr. President, the policy of the bill in any form. I have regretted that the project should have been entertained at all. I do not believe in the propriety of it, or in the policy of it. But if it is to assume the form which the bill granting bounties to the soldiers of the Mexican war did—a bill for which, by the way, I believe I voted; a bill for which there was a real necessity; for which there were high which there was a real necessity; for which there were high public reasons, and which can therefore be abundantly justified—if it is to assume that form, I shall certainly vote against it. If, therefore, these grants are to be made to these people at all, I am for granting them land at once, and not granting them scrip, for if we do grant them scrip, it will be brought into the market, and \$200 worth of land at the minimum price will be sold for from \$100 to \$125, and it will be taken by capitalists in enormous sums to the West, and sold there at the tull price, together with a stipulation of the very high rate of interest that is allowed in that section of the country. I am very sure, therefore, that the adoption of the amendment of my honorable friend from Virginia, although, on the one hand, it might secure some slight benefit to those soldiers that reside in his own State and in my State and in other parts of New Engown State and in my State and in other parts of New England, yet it will bring a very great evil on the country, and will secure to speculators, and capitalists, and usurers, a most normous advantage.

And I have to say further, that that advantage would be

greatly increased by the passage of the bill with the amendment now proposed by my honorable friend from Virginia. I believe that the present price of scrip for a quarter section of land is about \$120 or \$125. Now, I say, that the passage of the bill with the provision proposed by my honorable friend friom Virginia would undoubtedly have the effect of bringing down the price of that scrip, though if the amendment re-ported by the Committee on Public Lands be adopted, the price cannot be brought down below \$100. But if that is stricken out, we have no guaranty but that the price may be reduced even below \$100 for a quarter section of land. Probably it would not fall below \$100. But I have no doubt that the passage of the bill, with the amendment proposed by my hon-orable friend from Virginia, would have the effect of reducing the present price of this scrip in the market very probably con-siderably; it would bring it down to something like \$105 or \$110 for aquarter section of land.

I desire, therefore, Mr. President, that if this bill pass, it shall

pass in the form in which it has been reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with this proviso. And I wish to say to my honorable friend from Virginia, that with that amendto my honorable friend from Virginia, that with that amendment there will be secured to his constituents and to my constituents, probably, all the advantages which would result to
them, provided his amendment is adopted. If his amendment
is adopted, I have no idea that for a quarter section of land
his constituents would get more than \$105 or \$110. And in
regard to the burden that is to be thrown upon the treasury,
our experience under the Mexican bounty land bill proves
that that, in all probability, would be very inconsiderable.

I am therefore opposed to the amendment of my honorable
friend from Virginia. I think that the bill should stand as it
passed the House of Representatives, with the amendment
submitted by our Committee on Public Lands. If the amendment of the Senator from Virgina be rejected, this will be a
bill granting the land, the title itself, directly to the soldiers,
and they may go into the market and sell it as we sell other
property to which we have derived title.

But I utterly object to this system of issuing scrip, to be
thrown into the hands of capitalists, to be taken into the
Western country for purposes which are little better than usq-

rious—to enable the capitalists of the country, in place of realizing six or seven per cent. per snnum, to obtain from 25 to 50 per cent. per annum. That certainly will be the effect of the amendment of my honorable friend from Virginia.

Mr. WHITCOMB. I am opposed to both the amendments. As a bill granting public lands to the soldiers of the war of 1812 and the Indian wars, rewarding them for their gallant services in the hour of peril, and incidentally improving the frontier country, I can give it my cordial support. But I am opposed to attaching an amendment to a bill of so much importance which is calculated to defeat it. The honorable Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Smirs) has remarked that there have issued, under the bill granting bounty lands to the soldiers of the Mexican war, warrants covering some fourteen millions of acres, and but a quarter million of dollars only, I think he said, in the shape of scrip.

Mr. SMITH. I said there had been that amount of money drawn from the treasury.

the public lands. The amendment which I have proposed will have that effect, because this land scrip will be charged upon the Government only when it is brought in payment of the public lands, not the extent will the public lands, to that extent will the public lands be absorbed by actual settled will the public lands be absorbed by actual settled will the public lands be absorbed by actual settled will the public lands be absorbed by actual settled will the public lands be absorbed by actual settled will the public lands be absorbed by actual settled will the public lands be absorbed by actual settled will the public lands be absorbed by actual settled will the public lands be absorbed by actual settled will be public lands be absorbed by actual settled will be public lands be absorbed by actual settled will be public lands be absorbed by actual settled will be public lands be absorbed by actual settled will be public lands be absorbed by actual settled will be public lands be absorbed by actual settled will be public lands be absorbed by actual settled will be public domain, to doot the service will be charged will be charged will be charged will be charged on the public domain, to doot the amendment of will be charged will be actual to the solders of the mendment of the mendment of the mendment of will be charged will dred and sixty acres—being less than one half—what will be the effect of such a reduction? Evidently, under the first amendment, the drawing of the value of nearly the whole amount of lands authorized by this bill from the treasury, in the shape of scrip, redeemable only at the pleasure of the Govment, and entitling the soldier merely to his yearly pittance of interest from the treasury. As this scrip would only be one half of the minimium value of the land, the interest would be so mere a trifle that the cost of getting it would exceed its value, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it would not be collected. The consequence is obvious. Greedy capitalists and unscrupulous speculators would gradually absorb the reward of the poor soldier at a still further sacrifice, and there would be created a national debt in favor of capitalists, with no material or lasting advantage to the soldier.

The last amendment, in effect, allows the claim of the soldier to be transferred before he becomes the owner of the land. The committee properly regarded this as an evil, and their efforts to prevent it would, by this amendment, be frustrated. Experience has shown, as often as the policy has been utied, that the effect of the power of previous transfer is to rob the poor unsuspecting soldier who has perilled his life, and to enrich the speculator. If capitalists engross the soldier's pay in the shape of lands on the frontiers, unsettled and unimproved enough the state of the power of previous transfer is to rob the poor unsuspecting soldier who has perilled his life, and to enrich the speculator. If capitalists engross the soldier's pay in the shape of lands on the frontiers, unsettled and unimproved enough the state of the power of previous transfer is to rob the poor unsuspecting soldier who has perilled his life, and to enrich the speculator. If capitalists engress the soldier's pay in the shape of lands on the frontiers, unsettled and unimproved approved and contents the market of the speculator.

the shape of land warrants, they will be converted into owners of large bodies of lands on the frontiers, unsettled and unimproved, opposing the march of individual industry and national wealth. On the contrary, if the soldier is protected from being defrauded of his claim until he becomes the owner of the soil, and if living at an inconvenient distance, he will be able to command a better price for it. If he holds on to it after it is patented to him, it will constantly be increasing in value by the surrounding settlements. It will not only soon reach its par value, but in the present progress of the rapid improvement of our country, go far beyond it. Above all, it would serve as a home for the soldier in his declining years. The supposed inconvenience, arising from the distance of the soldier supposed inconvenience, arising from the distance of the soldier from the place where he desires to select his land, is easily ob-

patent sent to him.

It appears to me, therefore, that both justice and sound policy should induce us to reject these smendments. They are at least calculated to load down and embarrass the bill. I spenethend the friends of the bill will need all their strength to pass it, and it should be kept, therefore, as free from obje as possible.

The further consideration of the bill was then postpo

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 28, 1850. Mr. STANLY, from the select committee appointed

Mr. STANLY, from the select committee appointed on the 6th May last, made the following report:

The committee appointed on May 6, 1850, to inquire and report to the House of Representatives "what persons, holding office under the last Administration, as clerks, in any of the public offices, auditors, heads of bureaus, Commissioner of Patents, or Assistant Postmasters General, were correspondents of newpapers, wrote for or edited newspapers, their salaries and compensation for the same; and who, in particular, was the author of certain essays signed Bundlecund, and what office he then held; and also whether, during the last canvass for the Presidency, any of the above named officers absented themselves from their offices and official duties to make speeches and public addresses against the election of Gen. Taylor; also, whether the above named officers, or any of them, during said canvass, were called upon to subscribe or pay money for an electioneering fund against Gen. Taylor, and at whose instance this was done," beg leave to report in part, that, in discharge of the duties imposed upon them by order of the House, they caused several witnesses to be brought before them; that, among others, Thomas Ritchie, editor of the Union, and C. P. Sengstack, late keeper of the penitentiary in this District, were summoned and appeared before the committee; that the said Ritchie and Sengstack refused to answer questions put to them by the committee touching mattess referred to the committee by the House.

The cuestion was put to Thomas Ritchie: "State the 6th May last, made the following report :

committee; that the said Ritchie and Sengstack refused to an swer questions put to them by the committee touching matters referred to the committee by the House.

The question was put to Thomas Ritchie: "State what you may know in relation to the different subjects mentioned in the resolution of the House appointing this committee and now before you?" to which he answered as follows: "As to the correspondence of the Union, the committee must excuse me from answering. I do not conceive myself at liberty to betray the correspondents of my press," &c.

And this question was also put to Thomas Ritchie, viz: "Was the author of the communication in the Union of Sen-"Was the author of the communication in the Union of September 12, 1848, an office holder, embraced in the resolution of the House?" which question the said Ritchie declined to

answer.

And the said Sengstack, on being asked what he knew And the said Sengstack, on being asked what he knew in relation to the matters referred to in the resolution of May 6th 1850, said as follows: "As to the officers named in the reso-lution being called upon, or required to subscribe or pay mo-ney for an electioneering fund against General Taylor, I de-cline to answer, unless I can also state what officers paid money for an electioneering fund in favor of General Taylor."

Whereupon the committee adopted the following resolu

tion, viz:

Resolved, That the refusal of Thomas Ritchie and C. P Sengstack to answer questions propounded to them by the committee, be reported to the House, and its advice and order asked therein.

Which report is made accordingly. Mr. STANLY did not know that the Clerk had read the report with sufficient distinctness to enable the House to un-derstand it, and he therefore begged leave to make a short statement. The House were aware that some months ago this committee had been appointed, under a resolution he had offered as an amendment to a resolution offered by the gen-tleman from Illinois, (Mr. Richardson.) The committee had proceeded to discharge the duties devolved on them, and had summoned witnesses, and taken a good deal of evidence. In the execution of their duty, they had summoned Thomas Ritchie and C. P. Sengstack, who were the pillars of the Democracy in the years 1844 and 1848, and had propounded to them certain questions which they refused to answer, as stated in the report. The committee thought it would be improper to summon other witnesses, who would probably avail themselves of this excuse, and not reply to the inquiries put to them without some action on the part of the House. Not having any authority to proceed further, they reported

Mr. HIBBARD considered the whole investigation Mr. HIBBARD considered the whole investigation as trivial and unworthy to occupy the time of the House. He supposed that the House, at the time it authorized the appointment of the committee, thought that the members of the committee had talents that should be employed in something, and accordingly they gave them this duty to perform. Mr, Ritchie had been called on to inform them who were the authors of certain articles in his paper. He had refused to give them the information, that very properly, as he thought. What could they have done if they had ascertained the individuals? The question now presented to the House was. what could hey have done it they had ascertained the indi-viduals? The question now presented to the House was, whether they would take any action upon this great and im-portant matter. The editor of the "Union" declined to name the writers of certain communications for his paper. The ar-ticles contained nothing referring to the business or legisla-tion of the House. Mr. Sengstack had been required to say what persons holding office contributed money to the election of General Cass. It was their own money, and what if they did do it? They had a right to use it as they desired. He

moved to lay the report on the table.

Mr. EVANS, of Maryland, desired the gentleman to withdraw his motion; he wished to submit a few remarks on the

port.
Mr. HIBBARD declined.
Mr. STANLY demanded the yess and nays on the motion to lay on the table, which were ordered, and being taken,

were : Yeas 85, nays 108. So the motion was disagreed to.

Mr. EVANS, of Maryland, then obtained the floor, and was proceeding to submit some remarks upon the impropriety of Mr. Hinnann's making his motion to lay on the table,

when he yielded the floor to— Mr. MEADE, who desired to offer, in connexion with this subject, the following resolution:

Resolved, That the liberty of the press and freedom of discussion demand that editors of public journals should not be required by the Government, or any branch thereof, to surrender the names of their correspondents for mere political

After conversation between Messrs. MEADE, STANLY,

The SPEAKER stated that this resolution could only be rtained by unanimous consent. Objection was made.

Objection was made.

Mr. EVANS then proceeded with his remarks, in the

Mr. EVANS then proceeded with his remarks, in the course of which he denounced the editor of the Union, and thought that the House should insist on an answer from the witnesses to the questions propounded by the committee.

Mr. FITCH then obtained the floor, but gave way to—
Mr. STANLY, who offered the following resolutions: esolved, That whereas the select committee of this Horge by the authority of this House under a resolution of

rious—to enable the capitalists of the country, in place of 6th May last, has reported that Thomas Ritchie and C. P. realizing six or seven per cent. per annum, to obtain from 25 | Sengstack have peremptorily refused to give evidence in k have peremptorily refused to give evident to a summons duly issued by said com-

rant, directed to the Sergeant-at-arms, to take into custody the persons of said Ritchie and Sengstack, that they may be brought to the bar of the House to answer for an alleged contempt of this House, and that they be allowed counsel on that occasion, should they desire it.

The SPEAKER stated that, in his opinion, the gentleman could not offer the resolution at this time. The House was aware that the Chair was compelled to rule that a member could not offer a resolution or motion unless he was entitled to the floor, or except by unanimous consent. If there was no objection the resolution would be considered as before the

No objection was made. Mr. FITCH was about to proceed with his remarks

Mr. STRONG moved that the House proceed to the con-sideration of the business on the Speaker's table; which mo-

The bill of the Senate entitled "An act to establish a Territorial Government for Utah," was then read twice.

Mr. BOYD moved that the bill be referred to the Commit-On motion of Mr. SCHENCK, the bill was then ordered

Mr. CLINGMAN inquired, if a motion should be made t mr. Chindman inquired, it a motion another to make to reconsider the vote by which the bill was referred, would it bring the bill before the House for action, without a motion to discharge that committee from the further consideration of it? The SPEAKER thought not; the bill making an appro-

TEXAS BOUNDARY BILL.

riation, it must be referred.

The bill of the Senate entitled "An act proposing to the State of Texas the establishment of her northern and western boundaries, the relinquishment by the said State of all territory claimed by her exterior to said boundaries, and of all her claims upon the United States," was next taken up and read a first time, and the question stated to be on the second

reading.

Mr. INGE objected to the second reading—that is, he asked that this bill be subjected to the test prescribed in the 116th rule, which is as follows:

"The first reading of a bill shall be for information; and if opposition be made to it, the question shall be, 'Shall this bill be rejected?' If no opposition be made, or if the question to reject be negatived, the bills hall go to its second reading without a question."

The SPEAKER stated the question to be, "Shall this The SPEAKER stated the question to be, "Shall this

bill be rejected?"

Mr. HILLIARD desired to know whether the question

was open to debate?

The SPEAKER replied in the affirmative.
Mr. HILLIARD then addressed the House immediately in opposition to the motion. He said that his anxiety as to the state of the country impelled him to speak, and he proceeded to show that the House ought to act on the bills sent from the Senate and dispose of them. He made an argument in support of the title of Texas to the full extent of the territory claimed by her. Other centlemen, however, thought of this port of the title of Texas to the full extent of the territory claimed by her. Other gentlemen, however, thought of this title quite differently; and as Texas was willing to accept the line proposed in the Senate's bill, he was ready to vote for it, provided he could have assurances that the territory cut off from that State would not be subjected to some act of legislation hostile to the interests of the Southern States. As to the objection made by Northern men to the boundaries fixed by the bill for Texas, that it cut off territory from New Mexico, it was wholly presupported.

t was wholly unsupported. He exhibited maps brought by an American officer fro War Department in the Palace of Mexico, showing that the province of New Mexico was of very limited extent, and that its boundaries would not be in the slightest degree affected by the Senate's bill. The boundaries of that province were really not approached by the lines marked out for the limits of

Mr. HILLIARD carnestly hoped that Texas would not at tempt by force of arms to extend her jurisdiction; and that even if she did bring the disputed country under her laws, that force would not be used against her, but that Congress would settle the question. Texas ought to be generously treated, and not sent to urge her title before a court, however

He then gave his views of the duty of Congress to organize Territorial Governments for the inhabitants of the acquired Territories, spreading over them American law. An American Congress could do nothing less than this.

Mr. HILLIARD closed his speech by exhibiting the true character of our Government; complex, combining the principles of liberty, which originated with the Grecian States, with the modern representative principle; a government with checks and balances; and he insisted that our present troubles grew out of a departure of the General Government from its appropriate sphere. It must be restored to its true sphere. He denied that the Government was a failure, but, on the contrary, the noblest political structure which the world had ever seen, and conferring more actual liberty than any other system under heaven. Its overthrow would involve the whole country, North and South, in ruin, and would leave whole country, North and South, in ruin, and would leave the hopes of mankind in darkness which nothing could illu

Mr. McCLERNAND understood the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. INGE) to mean to test the strength of the bill by

s to be a test vote. He had said that he desired to subject the bill to the test prescribed by the 116th rule. Mr. McCLERNAND remarked that, if that was the test vote, he was prepared to meet it. He was opposed to debate now, because debate would not be followed by any practical

mow, escause details would not be londwed by any practical results. The bill cannot, in its present position be amended.

Mr. WOODWARD understood the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama to test nothing but whether the boundary of Texas to the Rio Grande should be made an open question. He would vote for it, simply because he was not willing to make a question where the United States have no right, honorably, to make a question.

Mr. INGE said that there seemed to be some misappre

nension. He knew that many gentlemen, those who usual y act with him, are not willing to admit that the boundary of Texas is a disputed question, or an open question. The arguments which had been made seem to concede that there arguments which had been made seem to concede that there is a question for the Government to settle. The controversy has been, what department shall settle it; and whether it shall be settled by the Executive or the Judiciary. They who sustain the views of the late message of the President are placed in the position that the Executive shall settle it.

tain the views of the late message of the President are placed in the position that the Executive shall settle it.

The question being taken: "Shall this bill be rejected?" and it was decided in the negative by the following vote:

YEAS—Messra Averett, Albert G. Brown, Burt, Cable, Campbell, Clark Colcock, Cole, Doty, Durkee, Giddings, Hammond, Sampson W. Harris, Hebard, Howe, Hubbard, Hunter, Inge, Robert W. Johnson, Julian, Preston King, Matteson, McQueen, Meade, Orr, Powell, Root, Sackett, Schooleraft, Seddon, Spalding, Wallace, Wilmot, Woodward—34.

NAYS—Messra Albertson, Alexander, Allen, Alston, Anderson, Ashe, Ashmun, Bay, Bayly, Beale, Bingham, Bissell, Bokee, Booth, Bowie, Bowlin, Boyd, Breck, Briggs, Brooks, William J. Brown, Buel, Burrows, Chester Butler, Thomas B. Butler, Cabell, George A. Caldwell, Joseph P. Caldwell, Calvin, Carter, Casey, Chandler, Clingman, W. R. W. Cobb, Corwin, Crowell, Deberry, Dimmick, Disney, Dixon, Duer, Duncan, Edmundson, Elliot, Alexander Evans, Nathan Evans, Ewing, Featherston, Fitch, Fowler, Freedley, Fuller, Gentry, Gerry, Gilmore, Gorman, Gott, Gould, Green, Grinnell, Hall, Halloway, Hamilton, Hampton, Haralson, Harlan, Isham G. Harris, Hay, Haymond, Henry, Hibbard, Hilliard, Hoagland, Houston, Howard, Joseph W. Jackson, William T. Jackson, Andrew Johnson, James L. Johnson, Jones, Kaulman, Kerr, Geo. G. King, James G. King, John A. King, LaSere, Leffler, Littlefield, Horace Mann, Job Mann, Marshall, Mason, McClernand, McDonald, McDowell, McGaughey, McKissock, McLanahan, Robert M. McLane, Finis E. McLean, McMullen, McWillie, Mescham, Millson, Moore, Morehead, Morris, Morse, Morton, Nelson, Newell, Ogle, Olda, Oris, Outlaw, Owen, Parker, Peaslee, Peck, Phelps, Phonix, Pitman, Potter, Putnam, Reyvolds, Robbins, Robbinson, Rockwell, Rose, Ross, Rumsey, Savage, Sawtelle, Schenek, Schernerhoro, Shepperd, Silvester, Sprague, Stanly, Ogie, Olds, Otis, Outlaw, Owen, Parker, Peaslee, Peck, Phelps, Phonix, Pitman, Potter, Putnam, Reynolds, Robbins, Robinson, Rockwell, Rose, Ross, Rumsey, Savage, Sawtelle, Schenek, Schermerhorn, Shepperd, Silvester, Sprague, Stanly, F. P. Stanton, R. H. Stanton, Stetson, Strong, Sweetser, Taylor, Thomas, Jacob Thompson, James Thompson, John B. Thompson, Thurman, Toombs, Tuck, Underhill, Van Dyke, Venable, Vinton, Walden, Waldo, Watkins, Wellborn, Wentworth, White, Whittlesey, Wildrick, Williams, Wilson, Wood, Young—168.

The bill was then read the second time.

Mr. BOYD said that, with the hore of easier the bills setted.

Mr. BOYD said that, with the hope of seeing the bills acted on without reference to any committee, and without delay, he

proposed to offer an amendment.
[The amendment was very long, and consumed a good deal of time in its reading. It proposes to add to the bill under consideration the Utah and New Mexico Territorial bills, as passed by the Senate, with the exception that those parts of the bills in which appropriations are made are omitted.]

The CLERK commenced reading the amendment, and had proceeded with it some time, when—

Mr. MEADE rose to a question of order. He called the attention of Chair to the 55th rule of the House, which stated that "no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment. No bill or resolution shall at any time be amended by annexing thereto, or incorporating therewith, any other bill or resolution pending before the House." The point was that this amendment was not germane to the bill; and further, because it proposed to annex as an amendment a proposition contained in another bill before the House.

The SPEAKER was of opinion that the bill before the House brought under consideration the question of the Territory acquired by treaty from Mexico, and, as the amendment affected that territory, it was germane to the bill, and was in order. On the second ground, the Chair understood the gentleman from Kentucky to say that this was not the same bill as that from the Senate.

Mr. BOYD stated that it had been slightly altered,

mendments be printed by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCLERNAND and others objected.

Mr. STANLY inquired what would become

the House adjourned?

The SPEAKER replied that if the House adjourned, it would come under the head of unfinished business, and be the first thing in order when the House next proceeded to the consideration of the business on the Speaker's table.

The question was then taken on the motion to adjou t was agreed to—yeas 109, noes 39.

And the House accordingly adjourned.

Thursday, August 29, 1850.

The SPEAKER stated that the regular order of business was the consideration of the report made yesterday by Mr. STANLY, from the Select Committee appointed on the 6th of May last, to inquire and report to the House of Representatives what persons holding office under the last Administration were correspondents of newspapers, wrote for or edited papers, the salaries and compensation for the same; and who, in particular, was the author of certain essays signed "Bundelcund;" and also whether, during the last canvass for the Presidency, any officers absented themselves from their offices and official duties to make speeches and public addresses against the election of General Taylor; and also whether any officers, during the said canvass, were called upon to subscribe or pay money for an electioneering fund against General Taylor, and at whose instance it was done.

Mr. FITCH, being entitled to the floor, made remarks in justification of the refusal of Mr. Ritchie to answer the interrogatories of the committee as to who were the authors of THURSDAY, AUGUST 29, 1850.

terrogatories of the committee as to who were the authors of of certain articles which appeared in the "Union" during the last Presidential canvass. He maintained that there was no principle of law violated by such refusal.

Mr. EVANS, of Maryland, next addressed the House, and

was followed by Mr. SCHENCK, whose remarks were in-terrupted by the expiration of the morning hour.

On the motion of Mr. McDONALD, the House proceeded to the consideration of the business on the Speaker's table.

THE TEXAS BOUNDARY BILL. THE TEXAS BOUNDARY BILL.

The SPEAKER stated that the first business in order was the consideration of the bill of the Senate entitled "An act proposing to the State of Texas the establishment of her northern and western boundaries, the relinquishment by the said State of all territory claimed by her exterior to said boundaries, and of all her claims to the United States." The first question was upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, (Mr. Boxp.,) and that gentleman

was entitled to the floor.

Mr. MEADE rose to a point of order. His point of order was based upon the 27th rule of the House, which pre-scribed the order in which the business on the Speaker's table should be taken up. The following was the third

table should be taken up. The following was the third clause of the tale:

"3d. Bills and resolutions from the Senate, on their first and second redding, that they be referred to committees, and put under way; but if, on being read a second time, no motion be made to sommit, they are to be ordered to their third reading, unless objection be made; in which case, if not otherwise ordered by a majority of the House, they are to be laid on the table, in the general file of bills on the Speaker's table, to be taken up in their turn."

He understood that the bill was now on its third reading. ["No!" "no!"] That being the case, this rule required that the bill be laid on the Speaker's table, in the general file of bills, to be taken up in their turn. Now, he submitted to the Chair that this bill was on its third reading. When the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky was offered, it was on its third reading, having been read the second time. He submitted that, under the rule, unless otherwise ordered He submitted that, under the rule, unless otherwise ordered by a majority of the House, this bill should be laid on the Speaker's table, to take its turn in the order of business, it being certainly a bill from the Senate on its third reading. The SPEAKER overruled the point of order, and stated

that this business was in order, as the first business on his table, on the ground that it was unfinished business of the House at the time when the House last had under consideration the business on the Speaker's table. If the gentleman examined the 27th rule, which he had read, he would find examined the 27th rule, which he had read, he would find that that portion of it had reference to bills of the Senate ordered to a third reading, and on their passage. The rule was, that the bill being read a first and second time, and no motion being made to commit it, that it should be ordered to a third reading, unless objection was made; in which case—that is, when ordered to a third reading—if not otherwise ordered by a majority of the House, it was to be laid on the table, in the general file of bills on the Stocker's table. wise ordered by a majority of the House, it was to be laid on the table, in the general file of bills on the Speaker's table, to be taken up in turn. When the House ordered the bill to a second reading, the question was then on its third reading. A majority could order the bill to be read a third time immedi-ately, provided it was engrossed; if it was not engrossed, it could not be ordered to a third reading. In the opinion of the Chair, when the House had thus taken up the business on the Speaker's table, that business unless the House had carthe Speaker's table, that business, unless the House had carit to a different stage from which it was when they ed from the consideration of it, as provided under this clause of the rule, came up as unfinished business, and was the first

ousiness in order under the rule.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Mississippi, appealed from the deci sion of the Chair. He thought the gentleman from Virginia was right, and differed from the Chair. He called the attention of the Chair to the fect that there was now a bill from the tion of the Chair to the fact that there was now a bill from the Senate—a bill in which a large section of the country was interested—which stood precisely in the position in which this bill stood. It stood as having been read a first and second time, with an amendment pending, and the previous question moved. He then argued against the decision of the Speaker.

Mr. McLANE, of Maryland, thought the gentleman from Mississippi was wrong. He submitted to the House that if there was any other course taken than that suggested by the Chair there would be no place where the bill could go. Un-less the bill was ordered to a third reading, the 27th rule

would not have been executed.

Mr. JONES wished to know if this question was debatable whether it was not a question in relation to the priority of

business?
The SPEAKER replied that it might probably be considered as a question of priority of business; but as it was an important question, the Chair allowed debate.

Mr. ASHMUN said that, believing that all this debate was

Mr. ASHMUN said that, believing that all this debate was unnecessary, he would move to lay the appeal on the table. The SPEAKER wished to make a statement to the gentleman from Mississippi in reference to the bill of the Senate to which that gentleman had referred. He understood the gentleman from Mississippi as stating that the bill from the Senate in reference to the grant of land to the State of Illinois was in the same condition as the bill under consideration. If the gentleman was correct, the Chair would rule that that bill had priority, and came up as this bill did, there being no distinction. There was this difference. The bill now before the House was taken up as business on the Speaker's table, and read the first and second time, and pending the question on ordering it to be read a third time the House adjourned, havog taken it up and considered it as business on the Speaker's able; and this was the reason that the Chair ruled it as unfinished business. The Senate bill referred to by the gentle-man from Mississippi was taken up, read a first and recond time, and then referred to one of the standing committees. It was then reported back by the standing committees. It was then reported back by the standing committee, and thus brought before the House, and in that condition considered by the House. When the House adjourned the bill went on the Speaker's table to the class of business to which it

The question was taken on the motion to lay the appeal on the table, and it was agreed to. The SPEAKER stated that the gentleman from Kentucky

was entitled to the floor.

Mr. MEADE wished to object to the third reading of the bill as he understood now was the time to object.

The SPEAKER stated that the question was upon the amendment; this was not the stage to object to the third

reading of the bill.

Mr. BURT claimed the floor of the gentleman from Kentucky. He did not know that the motion he proposed to make was a privileged question; but he thought the Chair yesterday decided erroneously in holding, that, as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Boxn) was on the floor to move an amendment, it was not in order for him (Mr. Bunt) to move to commit the bill. The rule which had just been read, as the House remembered, was in these words—so much of it as related to the point he would read:

opinion of the Chair, the motion, whether to commit or to amend, depended upon the member to whom the floor was assigned. This portion of the rule, as the Chair understood it, did not necessarily require that the floor should be given to

Mr. SCHENCK appealed from the decision of the Speaker and demanded the year and nays, which were ordered, and being taken were: Years 123, Nays 83.

So the Chair was sustained, and the amendment ruled in order.

The Clerk then proceeded with the reading of the amendment, which having been concluded—
Mr. CLINGMAN desired the gentleman from Kentucky to accept a very short amendment.

Mr. BOYD declined.

Mr. WILLIAMS (amid much confusion) moved to adjourn, the gentleman from Kentucky yielding to allow the motion to be made.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Mississippi, asked that the bill and amendments be printed by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCLERNAND and others objected.

Mr. McCLERNAND and others objected.

Mr. STANLY inquired what would become of this bill if the Mean and the proposed with the business, provided no motion be made at all. If no gentleman for with the business, provided no motion be made at all. If no gentleman from south the desired to inquire of the Speaker whether, in case these two amendments in case these two amendments abould be voted down, the bill or dering the bill to a third reading unless objection be made.

With this construction placed upon the rule by the Chair, in the section be made.

Mr. BURT said that he must appeal from the decision of the Speaker might recognise a member as entitled to the floor, who would not be done to the Whole on the state or the Union before the House of the Whole. The insisted that this bill appropriations of money shall be first discussed in a Committee of the Speaker whether, in case these two amendments in case these two amendments abould be voted down, the bill to read the provided that the floor in the reading unless to expetit to made at all. If no gentleman from South Carolina could not a stating the speaker whether, in case these two amendments abould be open to amendment if the previous question.

Mr. WILMOT desired to inquire of the Speaker whether, in case these two amendments abould be voted down, the bill to read the provided that the Chair. All the bill t

ment, which would cut off the prior right to move to commit
the bill; unless the right to commit the bill be recognised as a
prior right, and paramount to the right to amend the bill, the
motion never could be made.

Mr. ASHMUN moved to lay the appeal on the table.
Mr. BURT demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, were as follows:

Mr. BURT demanded the yeas and nays, which were ordered, and being taken, were as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Albertson, Alston, Anderson, Ashmun, Baker, Bay, Beale, Bissell, Bokee, Bowie, Boyd, Breek, Briggs, Brooks, William J. Brown, Buel, Burrows, Chester Butler, Thomas B. Butler, Cabell, Cable, G. A. Caldwell, Jos. P. Caldwell, Calvin, Campbell, Carter, Casey, Chandler, Clingman, W. R. W. Cobb, Cole, Corwin, Crowelt, Deberry, Dickey, Dimmick, Dixon, Duer, Duncan, Dunham, Eliot, Alexander Evans, Nathan Evans, Ewing, Fitch, Freedley, Fuller, Gentry, Gerry, Gilmore, Gorman, Gould, Green, Grinnell, Hall, Hamilton, Hammond, Hampton, Haralson, Harlan, Isham G. Harris, Hay, Haymond, Hebard, Henry, Hibbard, Hilliard, Hoagland, Houston, Howard, Hunter, Joseph W. Jackson, William T. Jackson, Andrew Johnson, James L. Johnson, Jones, Kaufman, Kerr, George G. King, James G. King, John A. King, La Sere, Leffler, Littlefield, Job Mann, Marshall, Matteson, McClernand, McDonald, McDowell, McGaughey, McKissock McLanshan, Robert M. McLane, F. E. McLean, McMullen, Meacham, Moore, Morehead, Morton, Nelson, Newell, Ogle, Olds, Otis, Outlaw, Owen, Parker, Peaslee, Phelps, Phoenix, Pitman, Potter, Reynolds, Richardson, Robbins, Robinson, Rockwell, Rose, Ross, Rumsey, Sawtelle, Schenek, Schermerhorn, Shepperd, Silvester, Sprague, Stanly, Stetson, Strong, Sweetser, Taylor, Thomas, Jacob Thompson, James Thompson, John B. Thompson, Thurman, Toombs, Tuck, Underhill, Van Dyke, Vinton, Walden, Waldo, Watkins, Wellborn, Wentworth, White, Whittlesey, Wildrick, Williams, Wilson, Wood, Young—154.

NAYS—Messrs. Alexander, Allen, Ashe, Averett, Bennett, Bingham, Booth, Bowdon, Bowlin, Albert G. Brown, Burt, Colcock, Daniel, Disney, Doty, Durkee, Edmundson, Featherston, Fowler, Giddings, Gott, Sampson W. Harris, Holmes, Howe, Hubbard, Inge, Robert W. Johnson, Julian, Preston King, Horace Mann, Mason, McQueen, Meade, Millson, Morris, Morse, Orr, Peck, Powell, Rote, Wilmot, Woodward—54.

So the sppeal was laid on the table, and the decision of the Cha

So the appeal was laid on the table, and the decision

Chair sustained.
The SPEAKER then stated that the gentleman from Ken-

Mr. BOYD said that the amendment which he had the honor to offer yesterday had been printed in the "Congressional Globe;" and in various other forms the bill and amendments, in all its imperiant features, had been published, and doubtless well considered also. He did not purpose, therefore, as he regarded it entirely unnecessary to do so, to take up the time of the House in explanation of the bill or the amendment which he had offered. Having taken no part in the very long and able discussion which they had had upon the general question of slavery, as connected with the terri-tory acquired from Mexico, he had intended to go into an examination at some length of the propositions contained in the bill and amendment; but he now determined to waive that intention, and to forego any purpose he had had to submit, at any considerable length, remarks upon this subject. The path was a beaten one. He had already investigated each and every important feature contained in the bill and amendment, and they all knew what they were. Every gentleman ment, and they all knew what they were. Every gentleman on that floor was as well prepared now to vote upon this question as he would be next week, next month, or next year. It had become a matter of importance whether they should consider this bill in a connected or a separate form. Various opinions and a degree of feeling was expressed in regard to that. Before he offered the amendment, he was spproached on one side and the other, and had received opinions so conflicting that he was left in doubt as to what his duty was. His object in offering the amendment was to test the sense of the House on the non-intervention principle, which had been sanctioned by the Democratic party, North and South. He did not desire to see an omnibus. If, however, the questions could be settled in that form, he should rejoice; or if by acting on the bills separately, he should still be content. He therefore proposed to withdraw that portion of his amendor if by acting on the bills separately, he should still be content. He therefore proposed to withdraw that portion of his amendment relating to Utah, to satisfy every body that he was acting in good faith, to test the sense of this body on the subject of non-intervention. He wanted to see the principle carried out. He wanted to see peace restored. He was for the Union and the Constitution as it is, and he wanted these principles faithfully executed. He was not so much for the Union because it protected us from foreign aggression, but Union because it protected us from foreign aggression, but because it protected us from foreign aggression, but because it protected us against one another. In the name of God, let us uphold the constitution. But, as he had already said, he did not intend to make a speech; it was time to act. He was astonished at the patience of gentlemen's constituents. He hoped that the House would now act. He withdrew so much of the amendment as related to a Territorial Govern-

as an additional section:

"Be it further enacted, That all that portion of territory sequired from Mexico by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo bounded as follows: By a line commencing in the Pacific ocean on the parallel of 36° north latitude, three miles from the main land; running thence due east till it strikes the Sierra Nevada; thence eastwardly and northerly with the crest of said mountain range until it strikes the parallel of 57° north latitude; thence due east with said parallel until it strikes the Sierra Madre: thence southerly with the crest of the same until it reaches the boundary between the United States and the republic of Mexico; thence westwardly with said boundary to the Pacific ocean; thence northwardly with the coast to the beginning. The whole of the said territory to constitute the Territory of Colorado; and that the Government of said Territory shall in all respects be similar to that provided for the territory of New Mexico by the accompanying provisions of this bill."

Mr. McDONALD raised the question that the amendment was out of order under the 55th rule, which states "that no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment." The CHAIR ruled the amendment to be in order, on the round that it related to the territory acquired from Mexico nder the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

Mr. ALLEN took an appeal from the decision

Chair, on which he demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. McDONALD desired to withdraw his point of order.

The SPEAKER stated that it could not be withdrawn, as was now in the possession of the House.

The year and nays were then ordered, and being taken

ere as follows : YEAS-Messrs, Albertson, Alston, Anderson,

of the House
Mr. CLINGMAN then submitted some remarks in expla-

Mr. THOMPSON, of Mississippi, rose to a point of order, which was, that this bill would have to go to the Committee of the Whole on the state or the Union before the House could consider it. He based his point of order upon the 133d rule, which provides that "all proceedings touching appropriations of money shall be first discussed in a Committee of the Whole." He insisted that this bill appropriated ten millions of dollars. In the third clause of the bill it was provided that ten millions of dollars was to be issued in scrip, bearing interest at five per cent. In the event that Texas accounted these terms, no further act was necessary for the cepted these terms, no further act was necessary for the House to adopt, but the President of the United States was

nouse to adopt, but the President of the United States was to pay the ten millions of dollars.

The SPEAKER was of the opinion that the bill did not require to be committed, in conformity with a decision made by the Chair and sustained by the House. The provisions of the bill authorized the officers of the Government to pay the money out of the Tressury without additional provisions by law. but made no secondariation of process. aw; but made no appropriation of money.

After conversation between Mr. BURT and the SPEAK.

Tellers were ordered on seconding the demand for the pre-vious question, and the House refused to second the demand: Ayes 74, noes 107.

Mr. ROOT demanded tellers, which were ordered; and

the question being taken on seconding the demand for the previous question, it was decided in the negative: Ayes 58, noes not counted.

Mr. McCLERNAND moved to commit the bill to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROOT moved to amead the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, by adding thereto the following instructions:

"With instructions so to amend the bill as to exclude slavery from all the territory acquired from Mexico by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, lying eastward of California."

Mr. MEADE rose to a question of order. The bill which the gentleman from Ohio proposed to commit with instructions was a bill concerning a question of boundary. It did not embrace the amendment at all. The Texas boundary had no reference to territory acquired from Mexico. It was,

not embrace the amendment at an analysis and had no reference to territory acquired from Mexico. It was therefore, entirely inappropriate.

The SPEAKER ruled the amendment in order. The question was to refer the bill to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. The Chair would rule that this

on the state of the Union. The Chair would rule that this question of boundary brought before the House the territory acquired from Mexico.

Mr. ROOT said that he desired a plain outright vote on this question. The gentleman from Kentucky offered his amendment, and said that he desired a plain outright vote. They would see whether those were right who argued as long ago as January that the House was against the proviso, or whether those were right who had said that the question never has been decided. The question was now presented so plainly that there was no more chance for dodging, if even they pretended the question was not fairly before the House. He had presented it as it was, so that the country might know what the House was for or what it was against. If

they pretended the question was not fairly before the House. He had presented it as it was, so that the country might know what the House was for or what it was against. If they could get the yeas and nays, which he intended to demand, they would smoke out the "dough faces" from both sides of the line. He demanded the yeas and nays.

Mr. McCLERNAND then addressed the House, expressing it as his opinion that the stability of the Government itself rested upon a satisfactory adjustment of this boundary question. The gentleman from Ohio had renewed a motion made at a very early period of the session, and which was then voted down. He was against the application of the proviso to the territory acquired from Mexico for many reasons, one of which was that he did not believe slavery could dwell there; it was excluded by the divine law of God. He believed the proviso to be mischievous, and of no useful object.

Mr. BROOKS also argued against the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. He was as ready at this moment, he said, to oppose this motion as he was at an early period of the session. There was a time when the Wilmot proviso was of use; but the Almighty had now settled this question, and it was impossible, by any decree of the House, to change this order of Providence. If non-intervention was to be the policy, let it be so. He was against exercising any power of the Government on this subject. He would not vote for any Wilmot proviso, north or south of 36° 30'. He stood there with a ticket signed by some forty thousand persons, of both parties, which would allow him to go in an omnibus, sulky, or government on the proviso was of the stood there with a ticket signed by some forty thousand persons, of both parties, which would allow him to go in an omnibus, sulky, or gowhich would allow him to go in an omnibus, sulky, or go-cart, or any other vehicle. He would, however, prefer that the measures should be acted upon separately, and one at a Mr. BROWN, of Mississippi, followed, and defended the

rights of the South to an equal partition of the territory ac-quired from Mexico, whether slavery was excluded by Divine w or not. Pending the question on the amendment of Mr. Root-

The House adjourned.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, 1850.

The SPEAKER stated that the first business in order was the consideration of the bill of the Senete entitled "An act proposing to the State of Texas the establishment of her northern and western boundaries, the relinquishment by the said State of all territory claimed by her exterior to said ment for Utah, for the purpose of simplifying the measure.

Mr. CLINGMAN then moved to amend the amendment which the gentleman from New York was entitled to the

Mr. CLARK replied to the remarks made yesterday by his colleague, (Mr. Bauoxs.) He (Mr. C.) was in favor of the Wilmot proviso, which was with him and his constituents a sentiment, an abiding principle. The reason why he voted against the Texas boundary bill was, that he knew it gave to Texas at least seventy thousand square miles of territory which never belonged to her; he knew that it gave to certain people ten millions of dollars of the public money, which did not go to those who fell at San Jacinto or the Alamo, but to the bears and bulls of the stock market—these were the ersons who would get much of it. He cared a great deal less about who would get much of it. He cared a great deal less about the money than the soil. Freedom would be robbed of seventy thousand square miles, while the Treasury of the United States would be robbed of ten millions of dollars. He objected to the bill because it gave the territory to Txas, and made it slave territory. When they gave the teritory to Texas, they not only gave her the sovereignty but they gave her the soil. He objected to the bill also on account of the shape of the boundary. He objected to it, too because they were called upon to do this under of a threat of disunion. With reference to disunion and sullification, he never steered his called upon to do this under of a threat of disunion. With reference to disunion and nullification, he never steered his ship out of the way, because of maginary rocks, and he believed they were imaginary. Jisunionists in this country are not so numerous as lunation the asylums. If, even in Texas or in South Carolina, asy really understood that disunion would take place, the some and children would cry themselves blind and the matun mad. Why, in all directions the nations of the earth semed to be clustering and clamoring around us. Another objection he had to the bill was, that it would set a preceded to pay revolutionary debts, and very soon we should hav General Lopez calling upon us for his pay. He was oposed to the extension of slavery in any form or manner. He did not wish to curtail the boundaries of Texas, but wared her to have all she has got and all she is

were as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Albertson, Alston, Anderson, Ashe, Ashmun, Averett, Baker, Hay, Bayly, Beale, Bissell, Boke, Bowdon, Bowie, Bowlin, Boyd, Breek, Brooks, Albert G. Brown, William J. Brown, Buel, Burt, Chester Butler, Gabell, George A. Caldwell, Joseph P. Caldwell, Casey, Cabell, George A. Caldwell, Joseph P. Caldwell, Casey, Chandler, Clingman, W. R. W. Cobb, Colcock, Corwin, Daniel, Deberry, Dickey, Dinmick, Duer, Duncan, Dunhan, Edmundson, Eliot, Ewing, Featherston, Fitch, Fuller, Gentry, Gerry, Gould, Green, Grinnell, Hall, Hamilton, Hammond, Harrison, Harshan, Laham G. Harris, Sampson W. Harris, Haymond, Hibbard, Hilliard, Hoggland, Houston, Jones, Kaufman, Kerr, La Sere, Leffler, Littlefield, John Mann, Marshall, Masson, Matteron, McCleranad, McDowell, McQueen, McWillier, Meade, Millson, Moore, Moreball, McQueen, McWillie, Meade, Millson, Moore, Moreball, McQueen, McWillier, Meade, Millson, Moore, Moreball, McQueen, McWillier, Meade, Millson, Moore, Moreball, McQueen, McWillier, Meade, Millson, Moore, Moreball, McGueen, McWillier, Meade, Millson, Moore, Moreball, McGueen, McWillier, Meade, Millson, Moore, Moreball, McGueen, McWillier, Martin, Millson, Woodward, and Young—128.

McQueen, McWillier, Mcade, Millson, Moore, Moreball, McGueen, McWillier, McGueen, McWillier, McGueen, McWillier, McGueen, McGierand, McGueen, McGierand, McGueen, McWillier, McGueen, McWillier, McGueen, McWillier, McGueen, McGierand, McGueen, McGierand, McGueen, McGierand, McGueen, McGierand, McGueen, McGierand, McGueen, McGierand, McGueen, M so the House remembered, was in these words—so much of it as related to the point he would read:

"But if on being read a second time, no motion be made to commit, they are to be ordered to their third reading, unless objection be made."

His point was, that before the gentleman from Kentucky could move an amendment, he had a right to move to commit the bill to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. He put it on the explicit language of the rule itself. He was destanted as the judgment of the treaty of pasce with Mexico. He had a right to say it is and so had some six or seven other gentlemen. He was against the Wilmot proviso, and denounced it, and had been all these questions. There were now two amendments pending the Union. He put it on the explicit language of the rule itself. It was very obvious that if he could not, while the gentleman from Kentucky had the floor, move to commit the bill, that motion could now be made. The gentleman had a right, those of the Ends which was before them was amendments, but upon the merits of these amendments by voting, and by proving was opposed to it. He regarded it as being among the most original federal measures ever proposed to the Americah other most original federal measures ever proposed to the Americah other most original federal measures ever proposed to the Americah other most original federal measures ever proposed to the term "dough-face," as the then spike of the term of dispose of these amendments, but upon the merits of the bill itself. He wished to say, being the most original federal measures ever proposed to the Hense of the term of dispose of these amendments by voting, and by proving the regarded it as being among the other amendments, but upon the merits of these amendments, because he believed that the bill which was before them was assumed as to the Minot proviso and conceived in sin, for the purpose of the treaty of psace with Mexico.

Congress. He then splaced to it. He nad some six or seven other gentlemen. He was dosensed to it. He

journ, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The House then adjourned.